



*League Of Wilderness  
Defenders ~  
Blue Mountains  
Biodiversity Project  
HCR 82  
Fossil, Oregon 97830*

*July 16, 2001*

(541) 468-2305 Asante Riverwind  
(541) 617-1009 voice mail  
(541) 468-2028 Karen Coulter

Comments on the Condon Wind Project  
Draft EIS

*Sheila Riewer,*  
Communications, BPA  
KC-7,  
George Darr, Project Manager,

Our organization has reviewed your draft EIS for the proposed Condon Wind project. Our concerns regarding this proposed project, issues with the draft EIS, and alternative suggestions are outlined as follows:

I. The likely mortality of birds, bats and other avian species resulting from the implementation of this project is unacceptable.

A. At this time, rather than approving the project as proposed, at most only a small pilot study wind power generation project should be temporarily, and conditionally, permitted to proceed. This pilot project should cover no more than five acres and employ turbines spaced 1.5 to 3 times more distant from each other than the proposed alternative. The pilot project should be licensed for a period of no more than five years and should be mandated to accomplish the following:

1. Research the total number of birds, bats, and other avian species killed, wounded, or otherwise adversely affected by the project and disclose the results yearly, and/or seasonally.
2. Establish an interdisciplinary team of wildlife biologists (ornithologists, etc.) and wind generation research engineers whose mission and objectives are to design, develop, and deploy wind power generation turbines which further successfully reduce and minimize mortality impacts to avian species. This team will explore utilizing methods and devices which warn and/or deter avian species from the generation area. Among known options are: 1. visible flagging, 2. sounds beyond the range of human hearing, 3. signals detectable by bats and other avian species, 4. deflection devices, 5. decoys of predators, etc. This team should also explore alternative development of wind generators which do not utilize large revolving blades. Options which exist include funneled wind-tunnel tubes (with screening, warning, and/or deflecting devices), as well as the development of wind velocity amplifiers and inverters.

II. The continuing sprawl of modern technological society's impacts upon surrounding/outlying natural, rural, agricultural areas must be minimized, and where possible reversed. In addition to or in lieu of I.A above, BPA and SeaWest should explore comprehensive research on location utilization and production--site specific energy production and conservation. Among viable options are: utilization of solar, wind, and rain power generation devices at the numerous diverse locations of energy need--eg: rooftops,

gutters, incorporation into building designs and structures--as well as energy efficiency, conservation, and cogeneration--all within the urban and industrial areas themselves. Need based self sufficient site production also has the added benefits of: 1. eliminating the need for much of the current large grid required for energy consolidation and distribution (as well as the inefficient energy loss due to this), 2. independence from the domino impacts of power outages, failures, limited available supply, 3. increasing the capacity to meet growing power demands which exceed that of the current grid systems' ability to deliver, 4. keeping industrial and technological impacts within already developed areas, thus preserving more natural and rural agricultural areas, 5. minimizing the further spread of the adverse impacts of emfs.

III. The draft EIS fails to adequately and accurately disclose the many known adverse impacts of electro-magnetic fields upon human health (including workers as well as area residents), the environment, and wildlife species. A supplemental EIS should be issued which fully discloses this necessary pertinent information, so that both the public as well as the decision maker(s) are fully informed as required by the NEPA.

IV. The EIS fails to present a comprehensive range of viable alternatives to the proposed action, including those presented in IA and II above.

In conclusion, we strongly advocate that this proposed project either be modified to incorporate the above concerns and recommendations, or that a new comprehensive EIS be completed which addresses the above issues and brings this proposed project into compliance with the NEPA.

cc area residents  
ONRC  
NRDC  
Audobon Society  
WELC  
NEDC  
Sierra Club

For the living earth,

*Asante Riverwind, co-director*

*Additional issues:  
EIS fails to assess  
cumulative impacts--past,  
present, & likely future impacts  
of this project and other area  
management/development impacts to  
avian species & area environment.  
Fails to address noise levels at turbines  
and their bearings age as well.*

